Dear Paul,

3/4/82

Thanks for the enclosures with your 3/2.

Mark, Jim and I had time for a little discussion of the propose CIA litigation Wednesday, when I was at the DC hospital for my regular checkup. I've not heard anything from Bud.

My own view is that it is a mistake for us not to join together and seek all there is to seek from the CIA. I won't take time for details. I've been wanting to get to this for years and have not been able to. Likewise, I also think it is a mistake to limit to what the CIA itself decided to disclose and then held off on. We have to make them also, which means in addition to Batch F, search to respond to specific requests not of their selection.

They may be unwilling, so we also must visualize the need to try to proceed with vigor enough to assail their reluctance and self-conceived immunities.

If you do not want to join us we will proceed alone.

Jim seemed to believe that Bud might prefer a narrower suit, too, but I'm not certain and if Bud thought it over he might now believe otherwise.

You say that if Bud agrees "I wouldn't object to referring (sic) to your requests also." You would be merely "referring" to much more than you would be seeking. I think that would get nowhere.

One sues or one doesn't; one tries to win or one looses.

If your main purpose is what you say it is, "to get my request sub judice before the FOIS goes away," the nature of the requets and what they ential is immaterial. And the FOIA hasn't exactly gone away yet. And does not appear to be quite that close it an end of any kind.

If I'd thought there was any value on the Murrets phone bills I'd have sent you copies. They are now filed in the basement and not as easily accessible to me, although I can get them. About a dozen pages. The covering letter is similar to their form ones, adapted to this subject. I don't recall that it has any content of any value. If you want them, not big deal, I'll copy and send.

Best wishes,